

FISCAL NOTE

Bill #: HB0306

Title: Requirements for setting aside nonresident big game and deer combination licenses

Primary Sponsor: Joe Balyeat

Status: Second Reading

Sponsor signature	Date	Chuck Swysgood, Budget Director	Date
-------------------	------	---------------------------------	------

Fiscal Summary

	<u>FY2002 Difference</u>	<u>FY2003 Difference</u>
Expenditures:		
State Special Revenue	0	415,222
Revenue:		
State Special Revenue	0	802,500
Net Impact on General Fund Balance:	\$0	\$0

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
	X	Significant Local Gov. Impact	X		Technical Concerns
	X	Included in the Executive Budget	X		Significant Long-Term Impacts
	X	Dedicated Revenue Form Attached		X	Family Impact Form Attached

Fiscal Analysis

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. The maximum additional revenue generated by the big game combo license is estimated at \$500,000 (\$975-\$475) x 1,000; and \$302,500 (\$850-\$245) x 500 for the deer combination license. The amount may be less depending upon how many licenses are sold in the new category of relative sponsors and the number of big game combo licenses sold without the deer licenses.
2. The Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP) does not currently distinguish between the number of hunters (or hunter days) on block management areas for those who hunt big game versus upland birds or waterfowl. For the purposes of this fiscal note, FWP will assume 80 percent of the hunter days on block management areas are days spent hunting big game.

(continued)

3. In FY 2000, FWP made impact payments to landowners in block management for a total of 250,000 hunter days. Assuming 80 percent of those hunter days were for big game, under this bill FWP would make compensation payments to landowners for 200,000 hunter days.
4. The current FWP practice is to provide compensation to landowners based on a formula using hunter days. The amount of \$12/hunter day to landowners who allow unrestricted big game hunting is an increase from the current amount set in administrative rule of \$10/hunter day. This will result in an increase in the cost of annual payments to landowners beginning in FY 2003. $(200,000 \times \$12) - (200,000 \times \$10) = \$400,000$ operations.
5. Additional staff time will be required to comply with the report back requirements of this bill. FWP currently administers 750 landowner-sponsored licenses with 0.25 FTE. Assuming all 1,500 licenses are sponsored by residents, FWP would need to add a staff person to comply with HB 306. (0.50 FTE, grade 8 and \$2,000 operations).
6. The effective date of March 1, 2002, assumes that revenues will be collected and costs will be incurred for the fall 2002 hunting season, which is FY 2003.

FISCAL IMPACT:

	<u>FY2002</u> <u>Difference</u>	<u>FY2003</u> <u>Difference</u>
FTE	0.00	0.50

Expenditures:

Personal Services	0	13,222
Operating Expenses	<u>0</u>	<u>402,000</u>
TOTAL	\$0	\$415,222

Funding:

State Special Revenue (02)	\$0	\$415,222
----------------------------	-----	-----------

Revenues:

State Special Revenue (02)	\$0	\$802,500
----------------------------	-----	-----------

Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Expenditure):

State Special Revenue (02)	\$0	\$387,278
----------------------------	-----	-----------

LONG-RANGE IMPACTS:

1. Potential increase in number of cooperators and enrolled acreage will be diminished, due to increased costs for existing acreage, cooperators, and levels of hunter use.

TECHNICAL NOTES:

1. Section 1 (6) (e) introduces the term "unrestricted big game hunting". FWP will assume this term to mean a landowner who imposes no restrictions on the species or gender of big game animals that may be taken, and who places no restrictions on commission-established fall hunting seasons.
2. Further amendments may need to be made to clarify that the 1,500 licenses come from the unreserved pool and do not represent additional nonresident licenses.